REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Reply is filed in response to the final Office Action dated October 18, 2010. In the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13-15, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,344,796 to Ogilvie et al. ("*Ogilvie*") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0130065 to Bloom ("*Bloom*"). Claims 12 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ogilvie* in view of *Bloom* in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0211834 to Fleckenstein et al. ("*Fleckenstein*"). Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ogilvie* in view of *Bloom* in further view of U.S. Patent 6,976,090 to Ben-Shaul et al. ("*Ben-Shaul*"). The listed rejections are addressed below. For the Examiner's reference, Claims 20-86 were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement and Claims 4-6 were previously canceled. Claims 1-3 and 7-19 remain pending in the current application for the Examiner's consideration.

Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ogilvie* in view of *Bloom*. Applicants respectfully submit that *Ogilvie* and *Bloom*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature of Claim 1. For instance, Applicants had amended Claim 1 in response to the previous Office Action dated May 10, 2010 to recited the steps of: (1) providing the customer a web browser enhancement tool that resides in the customer's browser, the web browser enhancement tool is configured to record and retain the customer's selected ADL from the list of ADLs; (2) retrieving the ADL from the web browser enhancement tool for use in shipping a product to the customer upon notification that the customer has purchased the product; and (3) providing the ADL to the vender computer system to use as a shipping location for the product purchased by the customer via the web browser enhancement tool automatically populating form fields of a vendor web page to provide the ADL address for upload to the vendor computer system.

On Pages 12 and 13, the current Office Action notes with respect to Applicants' amendment to Claims 1, 7, 9, and 17, that:

> [W]hile Ogilvie is directed to a secure regional and national/international package delivery apparatus and method for delivering goods to consignees when they are not physically present to receive them via a global communications network. Bloom discloses a bulk package delivery system to include but not limited to an ePD Delivery Process, specifically the ePD Billing & Maintenance application (via a linked internet web page) which can be a database and a set of programs to capture and maintain data related to customers, recipients, retailers, CDC's, RDC's, and shippers for use in the shipping operations of all ePD shippers. In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Office Action. Fleckerstein discloses a notification and authorization process for retrieval of packages, while Ben-Shaul discloses downloading CDML instruction and data structures. For the above reasons, Examiner believes that the rejections of the current Office Action is proper.

To clarify the Examiner's remarks with respect to Applicants' amendment to Claims 1, 7, 9, and 17, Applicants' attorney contacted the Examiner on January 6, 2010. Specifically, Applicants' attorney discussed with the Examiner the feature recited in Claim 1 of providing a customer with a web browser enhancement tool that resides in the customer's browser and is configured to record and retain the customer's selected ADL from the list of ADLs. Applicant's attorney first noted that the ePD Billing & Maintenance application described in *Bloom* can be a database and a set of programs to capture and maintain data related to customers, recipients, CDC's, RDC's, and shippers for use in the shipping operations of all ePD shippers. *See* ¶ [0062]. This information is maintained centrally on the master copies of a Customer table 1256, a CDC table 1252, a Zip Code-CDC table 1254, and Shipper table 1260, and an Employee table 1308 of the ePD Billing & Maintenance Application. *See* ¶ [0065]. Further, this information may be maintained in a database of each retailer's instance of an ePD Shipping Application by replicating the data from the master tables. *Id.* Thus, the information stored in *Bloom* is provided by a centrally located database and/or a database of a retailer's instance of an ePD

Shipping Application, not by a web browser enhancement tool that resides in the customer's browser.

The Examiner explained that the particular feature of the web browser enhancement tool recited in Claim 1 is taught by *Ben-Shaul* and specifically pointed to the remarks provided in the Office Action with respect to Claim 16. On Page 12, the Office Action submits the feature of downloading a web browser enhancement tool that resides in the customer's browser is taught by column 9, lines 12-17 of *Ben-Shaul*, which describes services for a particular edge server may be enabled by downloading of CDML instruction and data structures from an origin site, a target cite or a third party site, and by interpretation of the CDML code and data structure within the content. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ben-Shaul generally describes a technique for the transmission of content and applications across an internet. *See* Col. 1, lines 13-20. This technique involves a model termed differentiated content and application delivery (DCAD). *See* Col. 5, lines 40-42. In this model, content delivery is completely decentralized by delegation and off-loading of functionality and control from an origin site to a new web entity referred to as an edge server. *See* Col. 5, lines 42-63. In preferred embodiments of *Ben-Shaul*, each origin site has a set of subordinate edge servers that are geographically distributed and reside in the "edges" of the internet. *See* Col. 5, lines 64-66. Thus, requests for the origin site's content may be fulfilled by these edge servers. *See* Col. 6, line 65 to Col. 7, line 14.

The DCAD model supports several types of edge-level differentiation that can be mapped to various edge-level services. *See* Col. 7, lines 24-26. One of these services is different site views that allow for different views of a site to different customers. *See* Col. 8, lines 66-67. Specifically, an edge server may be located within a secured private client domain, such as an intranet, and can be used as a differentiation mechanism that provides special services for a particular class of clients and not to clients outside of the class who access the origin site directly or who access a shared edge server. *See* Col. 9, lines 1-6. As explained in column 9, lines 12-17 of *Ben-Shaul*, such services are enabled for a particular edge server by the downloading of CDML instruction and data structures from the origin site, the target site, or a third party site,

and by interpretation of CDML code and data structure within the content. These services may include: (a) configuring individual edge servers to allow or suppress certain privileged or allowable objects such as pages, images, or streams; (b) enabling the decoding and caching of encrypted pages at certain sets of edge servers; (c) enabling certain edge servers to display privileged links; (d) enabling particular edge servers to fetch desired material from different pages by conducting a process of URL translations or modifications; (e) enabling particular edge servers to decode and cache compressed information in uncompressed form; (f) enabling particular edge servers to copy or to allocate content fetched from the origin site to other local storage forms or formats; and (g) enabling particular edge servers to modify the content according to the service policy, information or tags which are included in the content itself or a user profile. *See* Col. 9, line 18 to Col. 10, line 24.

Thus, column 9, lines 12-17 of *Ben-Shaul* describes that services can be enabled on an edge server by downloading of CDML instruction and data structures onto the server. These particular services involve configuring and/or enabling the particular edge server to manipulate the availability and presentation of content for users. Such disclosure does not teach or suggest the feature of Claim 1 in which a web browser enhancement tool is provided to a customer *that resides in the customer's browser* and is configured to *record and retain the customer's selected ADL* from the list of ADLs. As shown, the cited section of *Ben-Shaul* describes downloading instructions and data structures that *reside on an edge server* and are executed to configure and/or enable the server to perform certain services. These instructions and data structures do not reside in a customer's browser, nor do the described services involve recording and retaining the customer's selected ADL so that the ADL may be provided to a vender computer system to use as a shipping location for a product purchased by the customer.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, (and *Ben-Shaul*), alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of Claim 1 under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 7-19

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 7-19 have been rejected as unpatentable over various combinations of *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, *Fleckenstein*, and *Ben-Shaul*. Claims 2-3 and 7-19 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore include all the features of Claim 1 plus additional features that further define the invention over the prior art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to independent Claim 1 and the additional features that further define the invention over the prior art, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of these claims under § 103(a).

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed October 18, 2010. The foregoing arguments and remarks are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (404) 881-7640 or e-mail at chris.haggerty@alston.com to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

The patentability of the independent claim has been argued as set forth above and thus Applicants will not take this opportunity to argue the merits of the rejection with regard to each dependent claim. However, Applicants do not concede that the dependent claims are not independently patentable and reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims at a later date if necessary.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required

therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher S. Haggerty/

Christopher S. Haggerty
Registration No. 58,100

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON January 21, 2011.